



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,920	06/29/2005	Wy Mun Kong	Q83222	3343
23373	7590	01/28/2010		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER PULLIAS, JESSE SCOTT	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/28/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/540,920

Applicant(s)

KONG ET AL.

Examiner

JESSE S. PULLIAS

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/226)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to correspondence filed 11/16/09 regarding application 10/540920, in which claims 1, 5, 13, 22, and 26 were amended and claims 1-32 are pending in the application and have been considered.

Response to Arguments

2. The amendment to claim 5 overcomes the objection for minor informalities, and so the objection is withdrawn.
3. The amendment to claim 13 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite, and so the rejection is withdrawn.
4. On page 10, the Remarks assert:

At pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner repeats the text of his discussion of Rankin from the previous Office Action at pages 3 and 4. This text is not applicable to the claimed invention at all, as the Examiner admits at pages 5 and 6 of the outstanding Office Action that Rankin has nothing to do with the basic focus of the invention, namely, transmitting from a common source to plural persons in a common venue who receive individualized transmissions in a selected one of multiple languages.

In response, only the portion of the text of the discussion of Rankin from the previous Office Action 09/05/08 at pages 3 and 4 that addressed the pending claim limitations as amended was repeated in the office action 06/16/09, in response to the claim limitations from the claim set submitted 04/27/09 which were repeated from the claim set submitted 05/30/08.

5. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion that "This text is not applicable to the claimed invention at all, as the Examiner admits at pages 5 and 6 of

the outstanding Office action that Rankin has nothing to do with the basic focus of the invention, namely, transmitting from a common source to plural persons in a common venue who receive individualized transmissions in a selected one of multiple languages."

The only admission on page 5 and 6 of the previous office action was "Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said venue, and respective identifiable locations in said venue." It is unclear why the Remarks appear to consider this statement to somehow be an admission that "Rankin has nothing to do with the basic focus of the invention". Further, the assertion in the Remarks that "This text is not applicable to the claimed invention at all" amounts to a mere allegation of patentability because it fails to specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

6. In response to the arguments on pages 10-11 that Rankin's disclosure of multiple users are not at physically identifiable locations, the rejection does not rely upon Rankin to teach or suggest this feature.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a venue, because in Col 1 lines 44-46, McCarten teaches a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin by providing communications in

at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source located at a venue to each of a plurality of persons as taught by Rankin, having respective identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said venue as taught by McCarten; electronically providing to each of said persons as taught by Rankin, at a respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue as taught by McCarten, access to a plurality of language options as taught by Rankin; electronically receiving at said centralized source from each of one or more of said persons in said venue an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options as taught by Rankin, for said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue as taught by McCarten; storing at said centralized source said language choices in a database as suggested by Rankin, in conjunction with said respective electronically identifiable physical locations in said venue taught by McCarten; and making said language choices accessible by one or more applications so that at least one of said applications can when operated selectively in said venue provide output to each respective person in the respective language choice as taught by Rankin, at said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue taught by McCarten, in order to allow digital communications and entertainment to be associated with substantially every seat in an airplane (McCarten Col 1 lines 5-9), thus avoiding the need for individual passengers to bring their own devices on board, as suggested by McCarten (Col 1 lines 17-20). Such a modification could be made by using the user terminals which are personal to the user taught by Rankin ([0012]) for each seat in the venue.

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

7. On page 11, the Remarks assert:

In the Response to Arguments at pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner comments with regard to arguments made as to dependent claims 9 and 11, and makes no mention of the independent claims.

In response, as was explained on page 3 of the office action 06/16/09, the remaining arguments on pages 9-12 of the prior Remarks (including those regarding the independent claims) were moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

8. On page 11, the Remarks also assert:

As to the dependent claims, the Examiner argues that Rankin's teachings in paragraphs 0029 and 0067 are not limited to pre-recorded public announcements and argues that the reference should be combinable with Kumano.

The Examiner's position, however, ignores the fact that Rankin is concerned with a transmission from a local beacon to the train, as the train passes by, so that local advertising and news can be directed to users on the train. The brief mention in paragraph 0029 of "announcements in different user-terminal selectable languages" has no accompanying detail. Such wireless transmission could be on multiple channels in different languages that are selected by a user, as one would select radio stations in a car. Similarly, the mention of personalized transmissions "to reflect individual language preferences or details" has no accompanying detail. At the least, there is no centralized source in the common venue that transmits selectively in one of multiple languages to respective users in the common venue.

In response, the arguments on pages 2-3 of the previous office action were that there was no evidence in Rankin to support a conclusion that Rankin necessarily depends on pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages, see page 2 of the office action 06/16/09. It is unclear why the fact that Rankin is concerned with a transmission from a local beacon to the train, as the train passes by, so that local

advertising and news can be directed to users on the train, is somehow incongruous with the position in the office action that there was no evidence in Rankin to support a conclusion that Rankin necessarily depends on pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages. Therefore, it is unclear in what capacity the Remarks somehow contend that the Examiner's position "ignores the fact", since the fact that Rankin is concerned with a transmission from a local beacon to the train, as the train passes by, so that local advertising and news can be directed to users on the train does not appear to have any relevance as to whether Rankin necessarily depends on pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages.

The Remarks argue that because the brief mention in paragraph 0029 of "announcements in different user-terminal selectable languages" has no accompanying detail, such wireless transmission could be on multiple channels in different languages that are selected by a user, as one would select radio stations in a car. The examiner respectfully disagrees, for at least the reason that in [0067] Rankin teaches "the above may be personalized in terms of the messages sent to *individual* user terminals, for example to reflect *individual* language preferences", (emphasis added), in addition to the reasons found in the advisory action 03/13/09, especially paragraph 2.

The assertion on page 11 of the Remarks that "At the least, there is no centralized source in the common venue that transmits selectively in one of multiple languages to respective users in the common venue" is not supported by the factual evidence in Rankin. For example, in [0015], Rankin teaches that the transport beacons reside on a transportation platform and are spaced to provide coverage, which implies a

central location, at the very least, in a geographical sense. Further, as illustrated in Fig. 1 and discussed in [0019], the Transport beacon on the transportation platform communicates directly with the user terminals in a one-to-many arrangement, and therefore may be fairly considered a "centralized source" in an additional sense of the hardware configuration of the wireless communications network aboard the transportation platform. The Transport beacon may be fairly considered to transmit selectively in one of multiple languages to respective users in the common venue for at least the reason that in [0067] Rankin teaches "the above may be personalized in terms of the messages sent to *individual* user terminals, for example to reflect *individual* language preferences", (emphasis added), as already explained above.

The arguments on pages 11-12 regarding real time translation are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection, necessitated by amendment.

In response to the arguments on pages 12 and 13 that McCarten does not teach centralized control, access and use of language choice as claimed, the rejection does not rely upon McCarten to teach these features. As discussed above, Rankin teaches "centralized control", access, and use of language choice. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

In response to the arguments on page 12 that Rankin and McCarten do not teach or suggest centralized storage of a language choice, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The transport beacon of Rankin may be fairly considered centralized for at least the reasons already discussed above. In [0029] of Rankin, user data and

geographical positions are stored in the transport beacon, which suggests that the chosen language is part of the user data and is also stored, since it is used for generating customized languages announcements, etc. Therefore, Rankin may be reasonably considered to imply, or at least suggest, centralized storage of a language choice.

The remaining arguments on pages 13-17 are the same or similar to arguments that have already been addressed above, and are not persuasive for the same or similar reasons.

Claim Objections

9. In claim 1 line 13, as well as claim 5 line 16, the examiner assumes "electronically identifiable locations" should be "electronically identifiable physical locations".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).

With respect to claim 1, Rankin suggests a multi-language communication method for providing concurrently communications in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source located at a venue to each of a plurality of persons having locations ([0029], a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, [0033], transmitting to user terminals suggests concurrent communications with more than one terminal used by more than one passenger, [0015], the transport beacon resides on a transportation platform and are spaced to provide coverage, which implies a central location), and discloses:

electronically providing to each of said persons at a location access to a plurality of language options ([0029], a basestation beacon communicates with transport beacons in geographic locations which offer different user-terminal-selectable languages, [0033], transmitting to user terminals);

electronically receiving at said centralized source from each of one or more of said persons in said venue an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options for said location ([0029] transport beacon receives preference from user terminals in order to transmit information in user-terminal-selectable languages);

Rankin suggests storing at said centralized source said language choices in a database in conjunction with said locations ([0029], user data and geographical positions are stored, which suggests that the chosen language is part of the user data

and is also stored, since it is used for generating customized languages announcements, etc.); and

Rankin discloses making said language choices accessible by one or more applications so that at least one of said applications can, when operated selectively in said venue provide output to each respective person in the respective language choice at said location ([0029], public address, news announcements, and adverts are provided in the chosen language, [0033] in response to present geographical location).

Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in said venue.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a venue (Col 1 lines 44-46, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin by providing communications in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source located at a venue to each of a plurality of persons as taught by Rankin, having respective identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said venue as taught by McCarten; electronically providing to each of said persons as taught by Rankin, at a respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue as taught by McCarten, access to a plurality of language options as taught by Rankin; electronically

receiving at said centralized source from each of one or more of said persons in said venue an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options as taught by Rankin, for said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue as taught by McCarten; storing at said centralized source said language choices in a database as suggested by Rankin, in conjunction with said respective electronically identifiable physical locations in said venue taught by McCarten; and making said language choices accessible by one or more applications so that at least one of said applications can when operated selectively in said venue provide output to each respective person in the respective language choice as taught by Rankin, at said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue taught by McCarten, in order to allow digital communications and entertainment to be associated with substantially every seat in an airplane (**McCarten Col 1 lines 5-9**), thus avoiding the need for individual passengers to bring their own devices on board, as suggested by McCarten (**Col 1 lines 17-20**). Such a modification could be made by using the user terminals which are personal to the user taught by Rankin (**[0012]**) for each seat in the venue.

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention providing output in a language on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice.

Kumano discloses providing output in a language on the basis of a real time translation into a language of choice (**Col 5 lines 25-30**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten by providing output in a

language on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice, in order to more quickly execute processing, a need identified by Kumano (**Col 8 lines 20-21**), which could be expected to better serve the needs of a user who is in a hurry.

With respect to claim 22, Rankin suggests a multi-language communication method for communicating concurrently with a plurality of passengers in a common venue, under centralized control, in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source in said common venue to each of said plurality of passengers having locations (**[0029]**, a base station beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, **[0033]**, transmitting to user terminals suggests concurrent communications with more than one terminal used by more than one passenger), comprising the following steps disclosed by Rankin:

electronically providing to each of said passengers in said common venue access to a plurality of language options (**[0029]**, a base station beacon communicates with transport beacons in geographic locations which offer different user-terminal-selectable languages, **[0033]**, transmitting to user terminals);

electronically receiving from each of one or more of said persons in said common venue an indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options for delivery, under centralized control, at a location (**[0029]** base station receives preference from user terminals in order to transmit information in user-terminal-selectable languages); and

providing, under centralized control, to each of said passengers who has chosen a language access to content in his or her respective language of choice at a location in said common venue ([0029], public address is provided in the chosen language, [0033], advertisements are delivered to each user terminal).

Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in said common venue.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue (Col 1 lines 44-46, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin by communicating concurrently with a plurality of passengers in a common venue, under centralized control, in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source in said common venue to each of said plurality of passengers, as taught by Rankin, having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in said common venue as taught by McCarten, by electronically providing to each of said passengers in said common venue access to a plurality of language; electronically receiving from each of one or more of said persons in said common venue an indication

of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options for delivery under centralized control as taught by Rankin, at a respective electronically identifiable physical location in said common venue as taught by McCarten; and providing, under centralized control, to each of said passengers who has chosen a language access to content in his or her respective language of choice as taught by Rankin, at a respective electronically identifiable location in said common venue as taught by McCarten, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

Rankin and McCartin do not specifically mention at least one option being on the basis of a real time translation into a respective language of choice.

Kumano discloses providing output in a language on the basis of a real time translation into a language of choice **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCartin by providing at least one option being on the basis of a real time translation into a respective language of choice for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

12. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754).

With respect to claim 5, Rankin suggests a multi-language communication

method for making an announcement, under centralized control, concurrently in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages to a plurality of persons, each person having a location ([0029], a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, [0033], transmitting to user terminals suggests concurrent communications with more than one terminal used by more than one passenger), and discloses:

providing to each of said persons in said common venue electronic access to a plurality of language options from said centralized control ([0029], a basestation beacon communicates with transport beacons in geographic locations which offer different user-terminal-selectable languages, [0033], transmitting to user terminals);

receiving under said centralized control from each of one or more of said persons in said common venue an electronic indication of a respective choice of language chosen by said respective person from said language options ([0029] base station receives preference from user terminals in order to transmit information in user-terminal-selectable languages);

electronically making said announcement in the form of a public announcement over a public address system in said common venue ([0029], public address or advertisements are provided in the chosen language); and

electronically making said announcement available under said centralized control to each person in said common venue who has indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a respective personal address system in said

respective language choice at said location ([0029], public address is provided in the chosen language, [0033], advertisements are delivered to each user terminal, so they are personally addressed);

whereby a respective person who has chosen a language can access said personal announcement in their respective language choice by means of their respective personal address system ([0029], a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, [0033], transmitting to user terminals).

Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue (Col 1 lines 44-46, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language.

Poch discloses a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten to include a principal language as taught by Poch, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention at least one announcement being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice.

Kumano discloses providing a message being on the basis of a real time translation into a language of choice (**Col 5 lines 25-30**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, and Poch by providing such that at least one announcement being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

With respect to claim 13, Rankin discloses multi-language communication system for making an announcement, under centralized control, to a plurality of persons in a common venue in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source in said common venue to each of said plurality of persons at a location (**[0029]**, a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in

different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, **[0033]**, transmitting to user terminals), comprising:

a database for storing a respective language choice of each of said persons on the basis of said location (**[0029]**, user data and geographical positions are stored in storage which is a database since it stores associated data fields);

a public address system for making said announcement in the form of a public announcement (**[0029]**, public address or advertisements are provided in the chosen language); and

a plurality of personal address systems, each for making said announcement available to a respective person, under centralized control, in the form of a personal announcement in the respective language choice of that respective person at a location (**[0029]**, public address is provided in the chosen language, **[0033]**, advertisements are delivered to each user terminal, so they are personally addressed);

a centralized control system in said common venue operable to select each of said personal announcements on the basis of said public announcement and said language choices, and to direct select each of said personal announcements to the corresponding personal address system of each respective person at a location (**[0029]**, a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, **[0033]**, transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language);

whereby each of said persons can access said personal announcement in their

respective language choice **[(0033)]**, transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language).

Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue **(Col 1 lines 44-46, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language, and wherein said language choice of a respective person comprises said principal language where said person has not indicated a language choice.

Poch discloses a principal language, and wherein said language choice of a respective person comprises said principal language where said person has not indicated a language choice **(Col 2-3 lines 59-10, one language being associated with**

a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten to include a principal language, and wherein said language choice of a respective person comprises said principal language where said person has not indicated a language choice, for reasons similar to those of claim 5.

Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention at least one announcement being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice.

Kumano discloses providing mention at least one announcement being on the basis of a real time translation into a language of choice **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCartin, and Poch by providing such that at least one announcement being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

With respect to claim 26, Rankin suggests a multi-language communication system for communicating concurrently with a plurality of passengers in a common venue, under centralized control, in at least one of a plurality of selectable languages from a centralized source in said common venue to each of said plurality of passengers having locations **([0029])**, a basestation beacon provides public address announcements

in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, [0033], transmitting to user terminals suggests concurrent communications with more than one terminal used by more than one passenger), and discloses:

Rankin suggests a database for storing a respective language choice of each of said passengers on the basis of said locations ([0029], user data (which suggests language choice) and geographical positions are stored which is a database since it stores associated data fields);

Rankin further discloses a centralized control system in said common venue operable to retrieve said language choices from said database and operable to provide each of said passengers with access to content in his or her respective language of choice ([0029], user data is stored in storage and retrieved for providing passengers content in respective language choices);

a plurality of output devices ([0029] user terminals), each assigned to a respective passenger for providing, under centralized control, said content to said respective passenger in his or her respective language of choice or, at a location ([0029], personalized services and adverts suggests each passenger has a user terminal).

Rankin does not specifically mention each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue.

McCarten discloses each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue (**Col 1 lines 44-46**, a set of unique seat display units which are associated with each seat in the airplane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include each of a plurality of persons having respective electronically identifiable physical locations relative to other of said plurality of persons in a common venue, and respective electronically identifiable physical locations in a common venue, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language.

Poch discloses if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten such that if no language was chosen by a respective passenger, providing in a principal language, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention at least one access being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice.

Kumano discloses providing mention at least one basis of a real time translation into a language of choice (**Col 5 lines 25-30**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCartin, and Poch by providing such that at least one access being on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice, for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention those of said persons who do not choose a language are assigned a language choice being a principal language.

Poch discloses those of said persons who do not choose a language are assigned a language choice being a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten such that those of said persons who do not choose a language are assigned a language choice being a principal language as taught by Poch, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

With respect to claim 3, Rankin discloses said application is an announcement system for making an announcement in the form of a public announcement over a

public address system ([0029], system provides public address announcements); and making said announcement available to each person who has indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a respective personal address system in said respective language choice ([0029], a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages to transport beacons in identifiable geographic locations, [0033], transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language);

whereby a respective person who has chosen a language can access said personal announcement in their respective language choice by means of their respective personal address system ([0033], transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language).

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language.

Poch discloses a principal language (Col 2-3 lines 59-10, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include a principal language as taught by Poch, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

With respect to claim 4, Rankin discloses said application is an announcement system for making an announcement in the form of a public announcement by means of a public announcement system, wherein said announcement is presented by means of

said public announcement system in at least each language choice ([0029], a basestation beacon provides public address announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages, so the announcement will be made in each chosen language).

With respect to claim 7, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention said personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of said announcement in the respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person.

Poch discloses a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person (**Fig 2, Speaker, Col 3 lines 65-67**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten such that a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person, in order to provide easy access for retrieval of the messages, as suggested by Poch (**Col 4 lines 3-5**).

With respect to claims 9 and 18, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one

or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person.

Poch discloses a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person **(Fig 2, Speaker, Col 3 lines 65-67)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten such that a personal announcement comprises a prerecorded audio translation of an announcement in a respective language choice of a respective person, played over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person, in order to provide easy access for retrieval of the messages, as suggested by Poch **(Col 4 lines 3-5)**.

Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention a real-time translation module.

Kumano discloses a real-time translation module **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**.

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, and Poch to include a real-time translation module, in order to translate messages that are not stored in memory.

With respect to claims 11 and 19, Rankin discloses forming a personal announcement **([0029]**, public address or advertisements are provided in the chosen language).

Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention real-time translation of a

text announcement and making said personal announcement accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display.

Kumano discloses textual real-time translation, **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**, and making the translation accessible by means of a display, whereby a person can read the translation on said display **(Fig 1, translated sentence display section 107)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, and Poch such that said announcement is a text announcement and said method includes translating said announcement by real-time computer translation into the respective language choice of a respective person to form said personal announcement, and making said personal announcement accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display, as taught by Kumano, in order to avoid storing translations in advance.

With respect to claim 12, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention making said announcement available to each of said persons who has not indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a personal address system in said principal language.

Poch discloses making said announcement available to each of said persons who has not indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a personal address system in said principal language **(Col 2-3 lines 59-10, one**

language being associated with a message identification datum and translations...receivers programmed to receive message in one language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten by making said announcement available to each of said persons who has not indicated a language choice in the form of a personal announcement over a personal address system in said principal language, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

With respect to claim 14, Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention a real-time translation module for providing any one or more of: text to text, text to voice, voice to voice, and voice to text real- time translation, so that said system can provide real-time translations of said announcement.

Kumano discloses a real-time translation module for providing text to text real-time translation **(Col 5 lines 25-30)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, and Poch to include a real-time translation module for providing text to text real- time translation, for reasons similar to those of claim 11.

With respect to claim 15, Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention said module comprises a server provided with real-time translation software.

Kumano discloses a module comprises a server provided with real-time translation software (**Fig 1, Col 5 lines 25-30**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, and Poch such that a module comprises a server provided with real-time translation software, for reasons similar to those of claim 11.

With respect to claim 17, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a prerecorded audio translation of the announcement in each available language choice, and is configured to play the appropriate audio translation corresponding to the respective language choice of a respective person over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person.

Poch discloses a prerecorded audio translation of the announcement in each available language choice, and is configured to play the appropriate audio translation corresponding to the respective language choice of a respective person over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said respective person (**Fig 2, Speaker, Col 3 lines 65-67**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten such that a prerecorded audio translation of the announcement in each available language choice, and is configured to play the appropriate audio translation corresponding to the respective language choice of a respective person over one or more personal loudspeakers located proximate said

respective person, in order to provide easy access for retrieval of the messages, as suggested by Poch (**Col 4 lines 3-5**).

With respect to claim 20, Rankin does not specifically mention a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons for providing said language options to each of said persons and to allow each respective person to select said language option.

McCarten discloses a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons for providing said language options to each of said persons and to allow each respective person to select said language option (**Abstract**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons for providing said language options to each of said persons and to allow each respective person to select said language option, in order to provide for applications such as gaming and data processing, as suggested by McCarten (**Col 1 lines 18-22**).

With respect to claim 21, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons, each of said consoles providing access to a plurality of predefined service request options, so that each of said persons can request the corresponding service by means of said console.

McCarten discloses a console having a display and a data entry device for each

of said persons, each of said consoles providing access to a plurality of predefined service request options, so that each of said persons can request the corresponding service by means of said console **(Abstract)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin to include a console having a display and a data entry device for each of said persons, each of said consoles providing access to a plurality of predefined service request options, so that each of said persons can request the corresponding service by means of said console, for reasons similar to those of claim 20.

With respect to claim 23, Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention providing to each of said passengers who has not chosen a language access to content in a principal language.

Poch discloses providing to each of said passengers who has not chosen a language access to content in a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations....receivers programmed to receive message in one language).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin by providing to each of said passengers who has not chosen a language access to content in a principal language, as taught by Poch, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

With respect to claim 24, Rankin discloses said content comprises promotional material ([0029], adverts are provided).

With respect to claim 25, Rankin discloses providing at least one announcement to each of said passengers by means of a personal address system, wherein said announcement is in the respective language of choice of each passenger ([0033], transmitting to user terminals, thereby making it a personal announcement in the chosen language).

With respect to claim 28, Rankin suggests said output device is a display, an audio output device, or both a display and an audio output device ([0033], advertising material, e.g. has to be either auditory or visual, [0003], PDAs and Laptops contain audio and video output devices).

With respect to claim 29, Rankin suggests said announcement comprises visual material displayable for each respective passenger on a display assigned to that respective passenger device ([0003], PDAs and Laptops contain video output devices).

With respect to claim 30, Rankin suggests said announcement comprises an audio announcement directed for each respective passenger to an audio output assigned to that respective passenger, whereby each passenger can listen to said announcement ([0033], advertising material, e.g. has to be either auditory or visual,

[0003], PDAs and Laptops contain audio output devices).

With respect to claim 31, Rankin discloses a public address system for making said announcement in the form of a public announcement to said passengers (**[0029]**, a basestation beacon provides public address announcements).

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a principal language.

Poch discloses a principal language (**Col 2-3 lines 59-10**, one language being associated with a message identification datum and translations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten to include a principal language, in order to avoid needlessly or arbitrarily translating into a language not desired by a user.

13. Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).

With respect to claims 6, 16, and 27, Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano do not specifically mention making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person.

Li discloses making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person

(Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano by making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person, as taught by Li, in order to increase marketability in the international sector, as suggested by Li (**Col 1 lines 13-15**).

With respect to claim 32, Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano do not specifically mention the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices from one or more of the passengers.

Li discloses the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices **(Abstract)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano such that the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices, as taught by Li, for reasons similar to those of claim 6.

14. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754) in further view of Glenn (6,434,518).

With respect to claim 8, Rankin discloses a personal announcement ([0029], public address is provided in the chosen language, [0033], advertisements are delivered to each user terminal, so they are personally addressed).

Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person.

Poch discloses a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person (Col 3 lines 65-66, Col 4 lines 31-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin and McCarten to include a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person, in order to provide the information in a language the user understands, as suggested by Poch (Col 4 lines 35-37), which could have advantages such as easy access, as suggested by Poch (Col 3-4 lines 65-5).

Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano do not specifically mention the personal announcement is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output.

Glenn discloses a message is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece

output allocated to a respective person, whereby a respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output (**Col 3 lines 40-42**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano such that the personal announcement is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output, in order to avoid disturbing others by using loudspeakers.

With respect to claim 10, Rankin discloses a personal announcement (**[0029]**, public address is provided in the chosen language, **[0033]**, advertisements are delivered to each user terminal, so they are personally addressed).

Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano do not specifically mention said personal announcement comprises a prerecorded text translation of said announcement in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display.

Glenn discloses a message comprises a prerecorded text translation of the message in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said message on said display (**Fig. 2**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Rankin, McCarten, Poch, and Kumano such that said personal announcement comprises a prerecorded text translation of said announcement in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said personal announcement on said display, in order to avoid disturbing others by using loudspeakers.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jesse Pullias whose telephone number is 571/270-5135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571/272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571/270-6135.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jesse S Pullias/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

1/22/2010